Application No. 10/716,971 Amendment dated March 6, 2006 Reply to Office Action of December 6, 2005

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action under reply, a final Action in this case, claims 1-45 and 96-140 were again rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 42-44 of U.S. Patent No. 6,649,138. The Office objected to the Terminal Disclaimer submitted previously, and a new Terminal Disclaimer, signed by the attorney of record, is submitted herewith. Accordingly, all grounds of rejection have now been addressed, and a Notice of Allowance is in order.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this communication, she is welcome to contact the undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dianne E. Reed

Registration No. 31,292

REED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP 1400 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, California 94304 Telephone (650) 251-7700 Facsimile (650) 251-7739

F:\Document\7725\0001\02\Amend10-25-05.DOC